



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,168	09/13/2000	Inna Vogel	003801.P015	7495
7590	12/22/2003		EXAMINER	
Andre L Marais Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard 7th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025			PATEL, JAGDISH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/661,168
Examiner	JAGDISH N PATEL

Applicant(s)	VOGEL ET AL
Art Unit	3624

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to amendment filed 9/23/03.

***Response to Amendment***

2. Claims 1-27 have been amended and claims 28-54 have been canceled per request.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments regarding 35 USC 101 rejection of claims 1-54 (now pending claims 1-27) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Accordingly, 35 USC 101 rejection of claims 1-27 has been maintained.

4. While the applicant's assertion regarding claim 1 as being directed to a tangible, concrete and useful result is persuasive, the amendment fail to cure the deficiency regarding the claim not falling within technological art.

5. The term "network-based" is recited in preamble without any support in the claim limitations and is not afforded any patentable weight. The term "automatically" does not reflect a technological art because broadly interpreted "automatic" means "acting or operating in a manner independent of external influence or control". The method steps "identifying..on of the multiple items as being irregular items" and "automatically

Art Unit: 3624

removing irregular item data" can be performed without manually by an individual without any aid of technological means.

6. Applicant's arguments, with respect to 35 USC 112 rejection of claims 1-27 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Accordingly, the rejection of claims under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite and unclear has been withdrawn. However, amended claims have necessitated new grounds for 35 USC 112 rejection(s). See appropriate section below.

7. Applicant's arguments, see section 4, pp. 4 and 5, filed 9/23/03, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-10, 15-16 and 22-25 (see para 18 of office action mailed 5/20/03) under 35 USC 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made for all pending claims in view of newly found art.

***Statute Cited in Prior Action***

8. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

9. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

[Note: The following analysis of claim 1 also applies to dependent claims 2-21.]

10. As an initial matter, the United States Constitution under Art. I, §8, cl. 8 gave Congress the power to "[p]romote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries". In carrying out this power, Congress authorized under 35 U.S.C. §101 a grant of a patent to "[w]hoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition or matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof." Therefore, a fundamental premise is that a patent is a statutorily created vehicle for Congress to confer an exclusive right to the inventors for "inventions" that promote the progress of "science and the useful arts". The phrase "technological arts" has been created and used by the courts to offer another view of the term "useful arts". See *In re Musgrave*, 167 USPQ (BNA) 280 (CCPA 1970). Hence, the first test of whether an invention is eligible for a patent is to determine if the invention is within the "technological arts".

Further, despite the express language of §101, several judicially created exceptions have been established to exclude certain subject matter as being patentable subject matter covered by §101. These exceptions include "laws of nature", "natural phenomena", and "abstract ideas". See *Diamond v.*

Diehr, 450, U.S. 175, 185, 209 USPQ (BNA) 1, 7 (1981). However, courts have found that even if an invention incorporates abstract ideas, such as mathematical algorithms, the invention may nevertheless be statutory subject matter if the invention as a whole produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result." See State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc. 149 F.3d 1368, 1973, 47 USPQ2d (BNA) 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

This "two prong" test was evident when the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA) decided an appeal from the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI). See In re Toma, 197 USPQ (BNA) 852 (CCPA 1978). In Toma, the court held that the recited mathematical algorithm did not render the claim as a whole non-statutory using the Freeman-Walter-Abele test as applied to Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 175 USPQ (BNA) 673 (1972). Additionally, the court decided separately on the issue of the "technological arts". The court developed a "technological arts" analysis:

11. The "technological" or "useful" arts inquiry must focus on whether the claimed subject matter...is statutory, not on whether the product of the claimed subject matter...is statutory, not on whether the prior art which the claimed subject matter purports to replace...is statutory, and not on whether the claimed subject matter is presently perceived to be an improvement over the prior art, e.g., whether it "enhances" the operation of a machine. In re Toma at 857.

In Toma, the claimed invention was a computer program for translating a source human language (e.g., Russian) into a target human language (e.g., English). The court found that the claimed computer implemented process was

within the "technological art" because the claimed invention was an operation being performed by a computer within a computer.

The decision in *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.* never addressed this prong of the test. In *State Street Bank & Trust Co.*, the court found that the "mathematical exception" using the Freeman-Walter-Abele test has little, if any, application to determining the presence of statutory subject matter but rather, statutory subject matter should be based on whether the operation produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result". See *State Street Bank & Trust Co.* at 1374. Furthermore, the court found that there was no "business method exception" since the court decisions that purported to create such exceptions were based on novelty or lack of enablement issues and not on statutory grounds. Therefore, the court held that "[w]hether the patent's claims are too broad to be patentable is not to be judged under §101, but rather under §§102, 103 and 112." See *State Street Bank & Trust Co.* at 1377. Both of these analysis goes towards whether the claimed invention is non-statutory because of the presence of an abstract idea. Indeed, *State Street* abolished the Freeman-Walter-Abele test used in *Toma*. However, *State Street* never addressed the second part of the analysis, i.e., the "technological arts" test established in *Toma* because the invention in *State Street* (i.e., a computerized system for determining the year-end income, expense, and capital gain or loss for the portfolio) was already determined to be within the technological arts under the *Toma* test. This dichotomy has been recently acknowledged by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) in affirming a §101 rejection finding the claimed

invention to be non-statutory. See *Ex parte Bowman*, 61 USPQ2d (BNA) 1669 (BdPatApp&Int 2001).

12. In the present application, Claims 1-21 have no connection to the technological arts. None of the steps indicate any connection to a computer or technology. The step of "automatically identifying" and "automatically removing" could be performed manually by a person based on certain established procedure and instructions. The term "network-based" could also include auction carried out through a network of participants at the auction facility or via Postal network, using a courier service such as UPS to deliver auction information. [Note: the term "network-based auction facility" is not accorded any patentable weight because the claimed invention does not depend on the origin of the second report] Therefore, the claims are directed towards non-statutory subject matter. To overcome this rejection the Examiner recommends that Applicant amend the claims to better clarify which of the steps are being performed within the technological arts, such as incorporating a computer or electronic network as appropriate.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

13. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3624

14. Claims 11 and 12 recites the limitation "choosing the predetermined price-based value from a plurality of predetermined price-based values", this limitation does not relate to "automatically converting" step because the predetermined price-based value already existed in the first currency. For example, the POS data include sales price data inherently in a first currency in which sales occurs at the POS (see discussion of Cook reference as applied to 102 rejection of claim 1). The conversion of the price-based values to a second currency therefore has no use in the choosing step. The claim is also rendered unclear as to the relation of step "automatically converting ..to a second currency" to any other limitation. *OK*

15. claims 18-21 recite limitations "storing a seller identification associated with the irregular item" and "restricting the user associated the user ..from using the network-based facility" have no relationship to any limitation of the parent claim. For example, claims 20-21 deals with restricting "the user associated with a seller identification" from using the auction facility, whereas the parent claim pertains to generating a "first report" where irregular item data corresponding to irregular items have been removed. Since, the relationship of the subject matter of the dependent claim(s)

is not properly established to that of the parent claim, the claim(s) are rendered indefinite and failing to failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

This analysis also applies to claims 19-21.

Claim 26. the limitation "wherein the irregular item flag can may be unset" does not limit any of the system elements "a database" or "a database engine server" and therefore is unclear as to how it affects the scope of the system.

Claim 27: it is unclear and indefinite as to how the "look-up" table relates to the functionality of the database engine server because the later does not require any "currency conversion rates and "price-based values based on auction categories".

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3624

17. Claims 1,4 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cook (US Pat. 5,895,453) (Hereafter Cook).

Claim 1: Cook teaches a method of generating a first report by filtering out item data in a second report in a network-based auction facility, the method including:

receiving item data from the second report corresponding to multiple items, the data including a price-based value for each of the multiple items

(see Fig. 1 and 2, col. 4 L 42- col. 5 L 44 the second report corresponds to "client polled record(s)" shown in Fig.2, As shown second report corresponds to and include audited POS data 2A "culled from various point of sale devices"..., which correspond to multiple items including a price-based value for each of the multiple items sold, the POS data 2A is received at extraction process 10 to "render data extracts 12" );

automatically identifying at least one of the multiple items as being an irregular item based on the price-based value for the irregular item being greater than a predetermined price-based value; and

(see col. 5 L 45- col. 6 L 26; see process of data extraction 10 and data extracts 12, which shows "suspect categories of records", which include "sales of selected types", "sales with any form of discount" etc. each of which inherently identify at least one of the multiple items as being an irregular item based on the price-based value for the irregular item being greater than a predetermined price-based value );

~~automatically removing irregular item data corresponding to the irregular item from the received item data to thereby generate the first report including filtered data.~~

(see col. 5 L 45- col. 6 L 26; see process of data extraction 10 and data extracts 12, which shows "suspect categories of records", which include "sales of selected types", "sales with any form of discount" etc. each of which inherently identify at least one of the multiple items as being an irregular item based on the price-based value for the irregular item being greater than a predetermined price-based value, data

Art Unit: 3624

extracts automatically removes (sorts) the irregular item data (suspect merchandise price data) as specified in suspect categories of records, the first report is generated as "exception list matrices" or alternatively "special request reports").

Claim 4. The method of claim 1, wherein the removing of the irregular item data includes removing the irregular item data from the filtered data.

(refer to Data extracts 12 which require that irregular (suspect) item data be removed (extracted) from one of the four categories of data records e.g. 2A as discussed in claim 1.)

Claim 23. (Note claim 23 recites a structure of the system in a "means plus function" format and accordingly analyzed as conforming to 112(sixth) examination guideline, see MPEP 2181 [R-1] Identifying a 35 U.S.C. 112, Sixth Paragraph Limitation).

Cook teaches a system for generating a first report by filtering out item data in a second report in network-based auction facilities, the system including:

means for automatically identifying at least one of the multiple items as being an irregular item based on the price-based value for the irregular item being greater than a predetermined price-based value;

(refer to Figure 1, audited POS data 2A, col. 5 L 8-15, "client polled data ..grouped in to different categories, for example "audited POS data" which inherently include sales data identifying at least one of the multiple items as being an irregular item based on the price-based value for the irregular item being greater than a predetermined price-based value)

and

means for automatically removing the irregular item data corresponding to the irregular item from the received item data to thereby generate a first report including filtered data

(Refer to data extracts 12, Fig. 2 which automatically removing the irregular item data corresponding to the irregular

Art Unit: 3624

item from the received item data to thereby generate a first report including filtered data (such reports for example include exception reports 8A)).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 2-17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook (US Pat. 5,895,453) and further in view of Anderson.

Claim 2: Cook fails to teach, however, Anderson in the same field of endeavor, teaches a method of generating a report including removing the irregular item data by setting an irregular item flag for the irregular item ;and

including only item data for items not having the irregular item flag this not set in the filtered data.

(refer to Table 3, col.6 and 7 Reports generated by invoice analyzer 32, Note irregular items are identified by irregular item flags "RED", Anderson also teaches including only item data for items not having the irregular item flag because these data is identified via GREEN and YELLOW flags) ).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Cook per disclosure of Anderson generate report by the aforementioned steps because it

Art Unit: 3624

would enable an user to generate reports with regular items as it is customary practice to generate reports for different applications, e.g. fraud analysis, accounting etc.

Claim 3 and 4. unsetting the irregular item flag of each item having an irregular item flag set if the item is found to be legitimate.

(these steps are inherent to Cook and in general any form of sales reports because they is required to maintain up-to-date records and accurate sales data. In particular, Cook teaches a form of unsetting of the irregular flags at step 82 shown in Figure 7. Note also that it is a customary business practice to periodically audit and correct sales report for accuracy and validity of the data presented therein).

Claims 5 and 6. Cook and Anderson fail to expressly show that irregular item includes a disingenuous bid per (claim 5), the irregular item does not physically exist (claim 6)

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in any steps of method claim including "removing" step. The "removing" step would be performed the same regardless of the nature or attribute of the irregular item. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability , see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically remove any irregular item because such information about the irregular item do not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed or patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 3624

Claim 7. generating the filtered data at predetermined time intervals;

(Refer to col. 5 L 33-36 Process 10 is typically fashioned to be performed at regular, routine, periodic, scheduled intervals, as in weekly or daily, and is not designed to run in continuous mode.).

Claims 8-10 are analyzed in a similar manner as claims 5 and 6.

Claim 11. automatically converting the price-based values of the multiple items from a first currency to a second currency and choosing the predetermined price-based value from a plurality of predetermined price-based values based on the first currency.

(inherently, Cook teaches that the second report presents POS sales data in a first currency and that the first report (e.g. exception list 8A presented in detail at col. 8-11).

~~Claim 12. Cook fails to teach that the choosing of the plurality of predetermined price-based values includes selecting the value from a table.~~

However, Official Notice is taken that choosing a value or a parameter from a table for financial analysis or generating a report is old and well known business practice. For example, some of the exception list reports may be based on sales based table of returns amounts by providing acceptable (or normal) amounts of returns provided in the form of a table.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to perform the choosing step based on selection of the value from a table because it would facilitate presentation of the filtering criteria in a convenient form.

Claims 13: Cook fails to teach automatically choosing the predetermined price-based value from a plurality of predetermined price-based value values based on a category in which the irregular item was auctioned within the network-based auction facility.

Cook teaches generating of reports pertaining to retail sales wherein goods and services are sold in many categories,

Art Unit: 3624

such as garments, electronics etc., each category requiring a different predetermined values to form a criteria for exception records. Therefore it is asserted that the choosing step as claimed is required and therefore inherent to generation at least one of the exception reports discussed in Cook.

Claim 14. wherein the choosing of the plurality of predetermined price-based value includes selecting the value from a table of predetermined price-based values.

(refer to analysis of claim 11).

Claims 15-17 are analyzed in a similar manner as claims 5 and 6.

Claim 22: all limitations of claim 22 have been analyzed according to respective method claim 1.

Claim 24. Cook teaches a system for generating a first report by filtering out item data in a second report in network-based auction facilities, the system including;

a database storing data concerning multiple items having a price-based value for each of the multiple items;  
(Audited POS data 2A, Figure 2)

a database engine server including an irregular activity monitoring system wherein the irregular activity monitoring system automatically identifies at least one of the multiple items as being an irregular item based on the price-based value for the irregular item being greater than a predetermined price-based value and automatically removes the irregular item data corresponding to an irregular item from the received item data to thereby generate the first report including filtered data.

(refer to claim 1 analysis, also refer to data extraction process (inherently including a server) which generates a first report of exception list matrices 8A).

Claim 25. analyzed as per corresponding method claim 2.

Art Unit: 3624

***Conclusion***

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jagdish Patel whose telephone number is (703) 308-7837. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin, can be reached at (703) 308-1038. The fax number for Formal or Official

Art Unit: 3624

faxes to Technology Center 3600 is (703) 305-7687. Draft faxes may be submitted directly to the examiner at (703) 746-5563.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113 or 308-1114. Address for hand delivery is 2451 Crystal Drive, Crystal Park 5, 7th Floor, Alexandria VA 22202.



Jagdish N. Patel

(Examiner, AU 3624)

12/12/03